UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/555,381	11/02/2005	Isao Miyadai	K0600.0213/P213	9515

24998   7590   02/12/2008
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 EYE STREET NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403

EXAMINER
ALLEN, NICHOLAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/555,381	MIYADAI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	NICHOLAS ALLEN	2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *(3)* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2006*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 November 2005* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☒ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/02/05 and 04/27/06*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objection

Claims 6-8, 25 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form

because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple

dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been

further treated on the merits.

Claim Construction

35 U.S.C 112, 6th Paragraph

With respect to Claim 28 the "means for" limitations do meet the three-prong test

requirement for invoking 112, 6th paragraph. The "means for storing definition data",

"means for storing a report", "means for selecting", and means for generating are

described in the specification as a host computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions
and requirements of this title.

Claims 9-24, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 9-24, 26 and 28 are

directed towards a program. It is non-statutory since a program is not any of a

process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.

Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or

expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer

components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such

claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional

interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a

computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In

contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is

a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships

between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the

computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32

F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish

claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory

inventions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoffman et

al (US 20030220806).

The Hoffman et al. reference teaches the limitation of claim 1 by having a method of

generating user-compatible business application data comprising the steps of:

entering an input report (See Page 4 Paragraph 56), which is accompanied by *data*

[time-related data (Due Date Report Module 230, See Page 6 Paragraph 73),

together with an identification code (unique identifier, See Page 4 Paragraph 56)

thereof to a generating system, said input report including data regarding one or a

plurality of items (Report Access Module 210, See Page 5 Paragraph 68)][1] and

having a format suitable for expressing results of user activities (open activities

report module, See Page 6 Paragraph 76);

storing the entered input report together with the identification code thereof in a

database of said generating system in order to make said input report available for

use in one or a plurality of application systems (See Page 5 Paragraph 56); and

generating a folder, which includes data required by said application system in a

format required by said application system, at a given timing prior to start of

business processing in said application system, by selection or manipulation of the

input report (See Page 7 Paragraph 86) that has been stored in said database and

of data contained in said input report without executing said business processing,

and delivering the generated folder to said application system (See Pages 3 and 4

Paragraph 50).

The Hoffman et al. reference teaches the limitation of claim 2 by having the method

according to claim 1, further comprising the step of generating said input folder by

---

[1] Applicant's claims have been fully considered, however, for the reasons noted above the nonfunctional descriptive material recited therein is not being given any patentable weight. For the purpose of applying prior art the nonfunctional descriptive material has been enclosed in square brackets; if necessary for understanding, the meaning as construed has been shown in italics.

selection or manipulation of an input report (See Page 7 Paragraph 86), which has been stored in said database, and of data contained in said input report in accordance with a folder generating definition (forms, See Page 7 Paragraph 88) that specifies how said folder is generated from said input report.

The <u>Hoffman et al.</u> reference teaches the limitation of claim 3 by having the method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of: selecting an input report to be used in generating said folder from among input reports that have been stored in said database (See Page 5 Paragraph 66); and generating said input folder by selection or manipulation of data contained in the selected input report in accordance with a folder generating definition (forms, See Page 7 Paragraph 88) that specifies how said folder is generated from said input report.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Ogawa et al</u> (US 5608874).

The <u>Ogawa et al.</u> reference teaches the limitation of claim 10 by having a system for generating user-compatible business application data, comprising: input report accepting means for accepting entry of an input report, which is accompanied by *data* [time-related data, together with an identification code thereof], the input report including data regarding one or a plurality of items and having a format suitable for expressing results of user activities (Subscriber Section 30, See Column 9 Lines 38-

50); database control means for controlling a database so as to store the input

report, which has been accepted by said input report accepting means, together with

the identification code thereof in said database in order to make the input report

available for use in one or a plurality of application systems (Subscriber Section 30,

See Column 8 Lines 28-39); and folder generating/delivering means for generating a

folder, which includes data required by the application system in a format required

by the application system, at a given timing prior to start of business processing in

the application system, by selection or manipulation of an input report that has been

stored in the database and of data contained in the input report without executing

the business processing, and delivering the generated folder to the application

system (Subscriber Section 30, See Column 9 Lines 7-22).

Claims 9 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang

et al. (US 5848426).

The Wang et al. reference teaches the limitation of claim 9 by having a program

for generating user-compatible business application data, comprising computer code

for implementing the steps of:

accepting entry of an input report (electronic verification process, See Column 8

Lines 6-20), which is accompanied by time-related data (time stamp), together with

input of an identification code (field identifiers, See Column 8 Lines 63-67 and

Column 9 Lines 1) thereof, to a generating system, said input report including data

regarding one or a plurality of items and having a format suitable for expressing

results of user activities (predetermined data fields, Column 9 Lines 1-5);

storing the entered input report together with the identification code thereof in a

database (database server 6, See Fig. 1) of said generating system in order to make

said input report available for use in one or a plurality of application systems (See

Column 6 Lines 19-26); and

controlling said generating system so as to generate a folder (translation table 38,

See Fig. 12), which includes data required by said application system in a format

required by said application system, at a given timing prior to start of business

processing in said application system, by selection or manipulation of an input report

that has been stored in said database and of data contained in said input report

without executing said business processing, and deliver the generated folder to said

application system (See Column 6 Lines 19-26).

The Wang et al. reference teaches the limitation of claim 28 by having a system for

generating user-compatible business application data, comprising:

definition data storage means for storing definition data that includes, with regard to

a folder to be applied to an application system, a folder data-item definition that

specifies a data item contained in the folder, a report selecting definition that

specifies an interval of a report to be used in creating a folder, type of report to be

used in creating a folder and a report data item that is to be included in a report to be

used in creating a folder, and a folder data generating definition that specifies how

data of a data item of a folder is generated from data relating to a report (Host

computer, See Fig. 1);

report storage means for storing a report having time data, a report-type code and

data of one or a plurality of report data items (Host computer, See Fig. 1);

report selecting means for selecting, from among reports stored in said report

storage means, a report, which is in line with at least any one condition, from among

a report in line with a condition that time data falls within an interval specified by the

report selecting definition, a report in line with a condition that the report possesses

a report-type code of a type specified by the report selecting definition, and a report

in line with a condition that the report possesses data of a report data item specified

by the report selecting definition (Host computer, See Fig. 1);

and folder data generating means for generating data of a data item of a folder,

which has been specified by the folder data-item definition, in accordance with the

folder data generating definition based upon data relating to the report by said report

selecting means (Host computer, See Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time
> the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter
> pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Hoffman et al</u>

(US 20030220806) in view of <u>Chen et al</u>. (US 6470170).

With respect to claim 4, Hoffman et al. does not teach the method including a report

interval definition that specifies the interval of a report to be used in generating said

folder, based upon time-related data accompanying an input report that has been

stored in said database. However, Chen et al. teaches using variable time intervals

and storing time-related data in a report (See Column 5 Lines 57-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Hoffman's method to include an

interval report interval definition as taught by Chen. This would have allowed

folders to be automatically generated that have time intervals such as payroll.

Claims 5/4/3, and 5/3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hoffman et al (US 20030220806) and Chen et al. (US 6470170) in further view

of Ogawa et al (US 5608874).

The above method teaches the limitation of claim 4. With respect to claim 5/4/3, the

above reference does not teach an identification code that identifies the type of

report or a report-type definition.

However, the Ogawa et al. reference teaches the identification code of said input

report includes a code that identifies the type of input report (See Column 15 Lines

59-65);

and said report selecting definition includes a report-type definition that specifies the

type of a report to be used in generating a folder (Step 360, See Fig. 6A-1), and an

input report of the type to be used in generating said folder is selected, based upon

the identification code of the input report that has been stored in said database, in

accordance with said report-type definition (Subscriber Translation Information 312,

See Column 16 Lines 19-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Hoffman and Chen to

include a code that identifies a report-type definition. These identifiers would have

allowed the reports to be quickly reused in the event that different types of folder

need to be generated.

5/3 is a subset of claim 5/4/3.

Claims 11, 12, 13/11, 13/12, 18/11, 18/12, 19/11, 19/12, 20/11, 20/12, 23, 24, 27,

and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al

(US 5848426) and Hoffman et al. (20030220806).

With respect to claims 11, 12, and 27, the Wang et al. reference teaches a program

for generating user-compatible business application data, comprising:

a definition accepting program for controlling a computer so as to accept, and store

in definition data storage means with regard to a folder (translation table 38, See Fig.

12) to be applied to an application system (See Column 2 Lines 63-67), a folder
data-item definition (field definition file, See Fig. 17 and Column 7 Lines 43-49) that
specifies a data item contained in the folder and folder data generating definition that
specifies how data of a data item of a folder is generated from data relating to a
report (Relationship file, See Fig. and Column 11 Lines 35-56).

Wang et al. does not teach a report accepting program for controlling the computer
so as to accept, and store in report storage means, a report having data. Wang et al
also does not teach a report accepting program, a report selecting program, or a
folder data generating program for controlling the computer based upon data.
However, Hoffman et al. teaches a report module 200 that includes Report Access
Module 210 (See Fig. 2 and Page 5 Paragraphs 66 and 67) that allows access to
other modules. Hoffman et al. also teaches a folder module, which includes data
required by said application system in a format (forms, See Page 7 Paragraph 88)
required by said application system, at a given timing prior to start of business
processing in said application system, by selection or manipulation of the input
report that has been stored in said database (See Page 7 Paragraph 86) and of data
contained in said input report without executing said business processing, and
delivering the generated folder to said application system (See Pages 3 and 4
Paragraph 50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang's method to utilize a report
accepting program, a report selecting program and a folder generating program.

This would have given a user control to prioritize the documents that were being processed as well as account for error being found in the initial reports. This would give the data a central location for faster retrieval by the application system requiring the information.

With respect to claim 27, it is also inherent for the software to be recorded on some medium in order for it to function.

The above method teaches the limitation of claims 11 and 12. With respect to claim 13/11 and 13/12, Wang et al. also teaches a report (Data File, See Fig. 16) that includes a data value (Relationship File, See Fig. 18) in line with at least one condition (Step 52, 66, and 76, See Fig. 15).

The above method teaches the limitation of claim 11 and 12. With respect to claim 18/11 and 18/12, the Wang et al. reference teaches the program, wherein said folder data-item definition specifies a plurality of data items included on one folder (field definition file, See Fig. 17 and Column 7 Lines 43-49);
and said folder data generating definition specifies how each item of data of the plurality of data items included in said one folder is generated from data relating to a report (Relationship file, See Fig. 18 and Column 11 Lines 35-56).

The above method teaches the limitation of claims 11 and 12. With respect to claim 19/11 and 19/12, the <u>Wang et al</u>. reference teaches the program, wherein said folder data-item definition specifies a plurality of data items included on one folder (field definition file, See Fig. 17 and Column 7 Lines 43-49);

and said folder data generating definition specifies how each item of data of the plurality of data items included in said one folder is generated from data relating to a report (Relationship file, See Fig. 18 and Column 11 Lines 35-56).

The above method teaches the limitation of claims 11 and 12. With respect to claim 20/11 and 20/12, the <u>Wang et al</u>. reference teaches the program, wherein said folder data-item definition specifies a plurality of data items included on one folder (field definition file, See Fig. 17 and Column 7 Lines 43-49);

and said folder data generating definition specifies how each item of data of the plurality of data items included in said one folder is generated from data relating to a report (Relationship file, See Fig. 18 and Column 11 Lines 35-56).

The above method teaches the limitation of claims 11. With respect to claim 23, the above method does not teach a report input deadline definition or a report requesting program for determining if a report has been stored by a deadline and outputting when it has not.

However <u>Hoffman et al</u>. teaches a folder module which stores deadlines (See Page 7 Paragraph 90) and a dues date module which generates reports based on activity (See Page 6 Paragraph 73).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method to include a report input deadline definition and determining whether a report has been stored by a specified deadline. This would allow the program to inform the user of a report that may require their input for completion if a due date has passed.

The above method teaches the limitation of claim 11. With respect to claim 24, <u>Wang et al</u> teaches the program, wherein said definition accepting program controls the computer so as to further store, in said definition data storage means, data [a folder data-item definition, report selecting definition and folder data generating definition with regard to each folder of a plurality of types] (See Column 3 Lines 46-52).

With respect to claims 29, the <u>Wang et al</u>. reference teaches a method of generating user-compatible business application data, comprising the steps of:

providing definition data storage means and report storage means, said definition data storage means storing, with regard to a folder to be applied to an application system, definition data that includes a folder data-item definition (field definition file, See Fig. 17 and Column 7 Lines 43-49) that specifies a data item contained in the

folder, and a folder data generating definition that specifies how data of a data item

of a folder is generated from data relating to a report (Relationship file, See Fig. and

Column 11 Lines 35-56);

and said report storage means storing a report having time data, a report-type code

(See Column 5 Lines 64-67 and Column 6 Lines 1-7) and data of one or a plurality of

report data items and generating data of a data item of a folder, which has been

specified by the folder data-item definition, in accordance with the folder data

generating definition, based upon data relating to the selected report (Step 78, See

Fig 15). Wang et al also teaches a report selecting definition that specifies an

interval of a report to be used in creating a folder, type of report to be used in

creating a folder and a report data item that is to be included in a report to be used in

creating a folder (See Column 3 Lines 66-67 and Column 4 Lines 1-5).

Wang et al does not teach selecting, from among reports stored in said report

storage means, a report, which is in line with at least any one condition, from among

a report in line with *data* [a condition that time data falls within an interval specified

by the report selecting definition, a report in line with a condition that the report

possesses a report-type code of a type specified by the report selecting definition,

and a report in line with a condition that the report possesses data of a report data

item specified by the report selecting definition].

However, Hoffman et al. teaches selecting, from among reports stored in said report

storage means, a report, which is in line with at least any one condition, from among

a report in line with data (Report Access Module 210, See Page 5 Paragraph 68).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang's method to include a report selecting definition and selecting a report that was in line with data. This would have allowed a user to choose from a plurality of different reports to be used by the various application systems.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al (US 5848426) and Hoffman et al. (US 20030220806) in further view of Williams (US 5600554).

The above method teaches the limitation of claims 11 and 12. With respect to claim 14/11 and 14/12, Williams teaches a report (Personal Action Form 1300, See Fig. 13) in line with data (Product Data 830, Time & Attendance Menu 1400, System Codes Menu 1600, See Figs. 8, 14, and 16) that is selected (Step 660, 665, and 675, See Fig. 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang's method to include a report in line with data. This would allow for reports to produce different types of folders for varying applications.

The above method teaches the limitation of claims 13. With respect to claim 15, Williams also teaches a report (Personal Action Form 1300, See Fig. 13) in line with

data (Product Data 830, Time & Attendance Menu 1400, System Codes Menu 1600,

See Figs. 8, 14, and 16) that is selected (Step 660, 665, and 675, See Fig. 6)

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang's method to include a report in

line with data. This would allow for reports to produce different types of folders for

varying applications.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al.

(US 5848426) in view of Chen et al. (US 6470170).

The Wang et al. reference teaches a definition accepting program for controlling a

computer so as to: accept input of the following definitions from an input unit, with

regard to a folder to be applied to an application system:

a folder data-item definition that specifies a data item contained in the folder (field

definition file, See Fig. 17 and Column 7 Lines 43-49);

and a folder data generating definition that specifies how data of a data item of a

folder is generated from data relating to a report (Relationship file, See Fig. 18 and

Column 11 Lines 35-56);

and store the accepted folder data-item definition, report selecting definition and

folder data generating defining in definition data storage means (See Column 3

Lines 66-67 and Column 4 Lines 1-5). Wang et al. also teaches indexed types of

report to be used in creating a folder (See Column 6 Lines 2-7). Wang et al. does

not teach a report selecting definition that specifies an interval of a report to be used

in creating a folder and a report data item that is to be included in a report to be used

in creating a folder.

However, Chen et al. teaches using variable time intervals and storing time-related

data in a report (See Column 5 Lines 56-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang et al's method to include a

report selecting definition.   This would have allowed the generation of folders

pertaining to systems that are time sensitive (i.e. payroll).

Claims 17 and 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wang et al (US 5848426) and Williams (US 5600554) in further view of Ogawa et al.

(US 5608874).

The Wang et al. reference teaches the limitation of claim 17 by having a program for

generating user-compatible business application data, comprising:

a definition accepting program for controlling a computer so as to accept, and store

in definition data storage means with regard to a folder (translation table 38, See Fig.

12) to be applied to an application system (See Column 2 Lines 63-67), a folder

data-item definition (field definition file, See Fig. 17 and Column 7 Lines 43-49) that

specifies a data item contained in the folder and folder data generating definition that

specifies how data of a data item of a folder is generated from data relating to a

report (Relationship file, See Fig. 18 and Column 11 Lines 35-56). Wang et al. does

not teach a report accepting program for controlling the computer so as to accept,

and store in report storage means, a report having data.

However, William teaches a method for securing and manipulating employee payroll

and human resource information that includes a report accepting program (Step 665,

See Fig.6 and Column 7 Lines 60-63) and a report selecting program (Audit Trail

Component 320, See Column 6 Lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang et al.'s method to utilize a

report accepting program and report selecting program. This would have given a

user control to prioritize the documents that were being processed as well as

account for error being found in the initial reports. This would give the data a central

location for faster retrieval by the application system requiring the information.

The teachings of Wang and Williams do not teach a folder data generating program

for controlling the computer based upon data.

However, Ogawa et al. teaches generating a folder, which includes data required by

said application system in a format required by said application system, at a given

timing prior to start of business processing in said application system, by selection or

manipulation of the input report that has been stored in said database and of data

contained in said input report without executing said business processing (Step 630,

See Fig. 9), and delivering the generated folder to said application system (Step

650, See Fig. 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of <u>Wang</u> and <u>Williams</u> to include a folder generating program. This would allow for the report information to be used with any of a plurality of different applications.

The above method teaches the limitation of claim 17. With respect to claim 26, <u>Wang et al</u> teaches the program according to claim 17, wherein said report selecting program and said folder data generating program control a computer having:

definition data storage means for storing, with regard to a folder to be applied to an application system, said folder data-item definition that specifies a data item included in the folder (Host computer, See Fig. 1);

said report selecting definition that specifies an interval of a report to be used in creating the folder, type of report to be used in creating the folder, a report data item that is to be included in a report to be used in creating the folder, and a data value to be included in a report used in creating the folder (See Column 3 Lines 66-67 and Column 4 Lines 1-5);

and said folder data generating definition that specifies how data of a data item of a folder is generated from data relating to a report (See Column 3 Lines 66-67 and Column 4 Lines 1-5);

and report storage means for storing a report having time data, a report-type code and data of one or a plurality of report data items (Host computer, See Fig. 1).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al

(US 5848426) and Hoffman et al. (20030220806) in view of Duckeck et al. (US

5065452).

The above method teaches the limitation of claims 11 and 12. With respect to claim

21, the method does not teach a definition that specifies that the number of reports

selected is data of a data item of a folder.

However, Duckeck et al. teaches storing the actual number of reports received and

evaluated in memory (See column 4 Lines 52-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method to include said definition.

This would allow the generation of a folder containing a condensed report falling

within a user's define parameters.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al

(US 5848426) and Hoffman et al. (US 20030220806) in further view of Bakuya et al.

(US 5680614).

The above method teaches the limitation of claim 11. With respect to claim 22, the

above method does not teach a folder-data generating trigger definition that

specifies timing in an application system.

However, Bakuya teaches a trigger definition that comprises trigger activation timing

to indicate when the trigger is to be made (to specify before or after the addition,

replacement or deletion of a record to the table) (See Column 1 Lines 52-55). This

is then followed by resource manipulation means (See Column 6 Lines 20-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method to store a folder-data

generating triggering definition that specifies timing for different programs. This

would allow data to be automatically generated at a predetermined time interval.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS ALLEN whose telephone number is

(571)270-3562. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays

from the hours of 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Robertson can be reached on 571-272-4186. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. E. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2169
12/31/2007

JAMES F. TRUJILLO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
AU 2169